

DAVID L. WHITEHEAD,
Plaintiff,
v.
GEORGE TENET, Director,
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
Defendant.

The Court has before it plaintiff's *pro se* "Motion to Vacate Dismissal Orders Due to Lack of Jurisdiction and Transfer Action to the Eastern District of Virginia," and defendant's August 29, 2000, opposition thereto. Plaintiff's motion, like so many others that he has filed with this Court, is entirely frivolous and will be denied.

Mr. Whitehead is now seeking to “vacate dismissal orders” and have this case

¹ In addition to denying plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, the Court also ordered that plaintiff was no longer permitted to file documents in this case, other than appeals, because it was closed. See Memorandum Opinion and Order of June 3, 1997, at 5. Plaintiff apparently has forgotten about this restriction yet again, as this is the second motion that he has filed since the prohibition was first put in place.

transferred to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Plaintiff's one-page motion is as senseless and frivolous as most of what he has filed in this Court over the past decade.² It is entirely

²Plaintiff has filed no less than 23 lawsuits in this jurisdiction, including suits against film companies, publishing companies, actors, producers, writers and directors, President Clinton, the United States Department of Justice, the Washington Post, the Internal Revenue Service, a District of Columbia School Superintendent, the CIA, and Georgetown University. Every one of these suits has been dismissed or resolved in defendants' favor. See Whitehead v. Clinton, Civ. Action No. 99-2891 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 2000 WL 520719 (D.C. Cir. March 23, 2000); Whitehead v. DreamWorks, Civ. Action No. 98-1917 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Columbia Pictures, Civ. Action No. 98-1882 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. New Line Cinema, Civ. Action No. 98-1231 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Time Warner, Civ. Action No. 98-0257 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Metro Goldwyn Mayer, Civ. Action No. 98-0256 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Carroll & Graf, Civ. Action No. 98-0202 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Warner Bros., Civ. Action No. 97-0752 (D.D.C.) (dismissed); Whitehead v. Paramount Pictures Corp., Civ. Action No. 96-2436, 53 F. Supp. 2d 38 (D.D.C. 1999) (dismissed), *aff'd*, No. 99-7137 (D.C. Cir. April 19, 2000); Whitehead v. Paramount Pictures Corp., Civ. Action No. 96-1616 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1997 WL 150111 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 27, 1997); Whitehead v. Smith, Civ. Action No. 96-1307 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1996 WL 761937 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 20, 1996); Whitehead v. Deutch, Civ. Action No. 96-0420 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1997 WL 573476 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 22, 1997), *cert. denied*, 522 U.S. 1129 (1998); Whitehead v. Days, Civ. Action No. 96-0159 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1996 WL 525507 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 16, 1996); Whitehead v. Reno, Civ. Action No. 96-0049 (D.D.C.), *aff'd*, 1996 WL 761943 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 27, 1996); Whitehead v. Washington Post, Civ. Action No. 95-1647 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1996 WL 246815 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 18, 1996), *cert. denied*, 519 U.S. 877 (1996); Whitehead v. O'Donovan, Civ. Action No. 12393-94 (D.C. Sup. Ct.); Whitehead v. O'Donovan, Civ. Action No. 7034-94 (D.C. Sup. Ct.); Whitehead v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1994 WL 730903 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 14, 1994) (dismissing appeal from tax court for lack of jurisdiction); Whitehead v. Greenstein, Misc. No. 94-0085 (D.D.C.) (denying motion to enforce subpoena), *aff'd*, 1994 WL 535410 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 26, 1994); Whitehead v. Greer, Civ. Action No. 93-2023 (D.D.C.) (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1994 WL 189133 (D.C. Apr. 19, 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 966 (1994); Whitehead v. Jenifer, 1992 WL 311212 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 14, 1992) (dismissed), *cert. denied*, 506 U.S. 1084 (1993); Whitehead v. Gates, Civ. Action No. 92-0917 (dismissed), *aff'd*, 1993 WL 328105 (D.C. Cir. July 27, 1993). In several of these cases, defendants' counsel have offered declarations, unrebutted by plaintiff, that Mr. Whitehead has indicated that his sole purpose in bringing these lawsuits is to extract nuisance settlements. See Declaration of Jeffrey W. Kilduff, attached to defendants' Motion for Stay and Sanctions, Dec. 2, 1998, Whitehead v. Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc., Civil Action No. 98-2938 (D.D.C.) ("Mr. Whitehead . . . stated that he would stop suing defendants and other studios if defendants would simply pay him money to go away. Mr. Whitehead again made clear that he intends to continue inundating the defendants and this Court with copyright infringement actions in the hopes of extracting a nuisance

without merit and will be denied.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion is DENIED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff is prohibited from filing anything further in this closed case without first seeking leave of Court. From this day forward, the Clerk's Office is directed not to permit any document submitted by plaintiff in this or any other closed case to be filed without the Court first determining whether plaintiff should be granted leave to file the document.

SO ORDERED.

PAUL L. FRIEDMAN
United States District Judge

DATE:

settlement."); Declaration of Jeffrey W. Kilduff, attached to Motion for Protective Order, Nov. 19, 1996, Whitehead v. Paramount Pictures Corp., Civil Action No. 96-2436 (D.D.C) ("Plaintiff has repeatedly explained that he would continue with his barrage of motions so that Defendants would have to incur substantial legal fees in order to respond. He has admitted that his strategy is to make litigating this case so expensive to Defendants that they will pay plaintiff to go away.").